UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,577	04/26/2001	Robert James Lawson	13DV13821	7443

29399 7590 12/03/2004

JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER	
PHAM, HUNG Q	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2162	

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/842,577	LAWSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q PHAM	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 August 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/03/2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant added new features to claims 1, 5 and 16 in the amendment filed on 05/06/2004. Applicant's arguments with respect to theses new features will be answered in the following action.

3. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the missing of ***pre-determined rules*** in Kraenzel technique could be supported by the taught of Behera

because both of the technique is to optimize documents access based on access control list.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As in claims 1 and 5, the claimed retrieving from the centralized database, an exception access rule including pre-established criteria; applying the exception access rule to the completed request for quick approval; and automatically approving access based on the exception access rule are not supported by the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 16 merely recites non-functional descriptive material. The claim recites a plurality of data elements absent any functional interrelationship to result in a data structure. The preamble recites " ***database*** " but fails to limit the claim to a tangibly embodied version of the database. Additionally, applicants' use of "***corresponding to*** " throughout the claim raises a question as to what the data is, since the data itself which is referred to is not positively recited in the claim, merely something that "corresponds to" the various forms of data described.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879].

Regarding claim 1, Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, Lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 1, a profile

compiling/updating object 32 may use the information received from user affinity determining object 30 to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 2, Lines 65-67) as the step of ***creating an electronic profile for a user within a centralized database***. To prevent access to objects containing, for example, confidential or proprietary information, users may be assigned levels of access privileges. Access privileges may be, for example, read-only, edit, etc. Access privileges may be assigned by a system administrator and stored in an access control list or ACL (Kraenzel, Col. 1, Lines 18-26) as the step of ***creating*** an ACL as ***an electronic profile for data within the centralized database***. As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 20-31). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object as discussed as ***methodology is established for user access***. In order to grant access to a requested object or ***making a decision with reference to the user access***, access privileges in ACL and user profile are compared, and the procedure is processed as at step 156-158 to ***complete an evaluation based on the electronic profiles, and operating methodology in response to a request from the user for access***. Returning to FIG. 3, step 156 determines ***if*** the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), ***the user is denied access***, and step 162 ***prompts the user to complete a request for quick approval*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4,

Lines 31-35). Step 166 determines if additional privilege have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, the ACL is updated to retrieve and present the requested object to the user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 35-43). As seen, additional privilege as ***additional rule including pre-established criteria***, determining the granting status of additional privilege indicates the step of ***applying the access rule to the completed request for quick approval***, and granting the additional privilege indicates the step of ***approving automatically access based on the exception rule***. Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the additional privilege is ***retrieved from the centralized database, pre-determined rules are established*** in addition with methodology as discussed above, and ***the evaluation based on pre-determined rules***. However, step 154 of FIG. 3 teaches that access privileges have to be retrieved from the database (Col. 4, Lines 25-26). Thus, additional privilege, obviously, has to be ***retrieved from the database*** also. Behera teaches a method to control access via properties system by providing ACL rules based on the properties associated with the entries (Behera, Col. 1, line 64-Col. 2, line 5). Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules*** (Behera, Col. 4, Lines 25-54) and ***evaluating the pre-determined rules*** to grant access to a user (Behera, Col. 6, Lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by applying the access rules to the ACL as taught by Behera in order to grant access to a user or a group to a particular attribute object in the database.

Regarding claim 3, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating data profiles based on at least one of Data Elements, Data Tags, Rules of Access, an Approver's Name for Each Rule of Access, Rules of Exclusion, an Exception List, and Field Tags*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-26).

Regarding claim 4, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 3, Behera further discloses the step of ***establishing pre-determined rules in the centralized database based on at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines; and establishing methodology to ensure timely and accurate decision making based on criteria established by the management*** (Behera, Col. 4, lines 26-55).

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Behera [USP 6,535,879], CERN [Administrative Information Services, Oracle HR] and Lillibridge [USP 6,195,698 B1].

Regarding claim 2, Kraenzel and Behera, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 1, but fails to disclose the step

of ***creating an electronic profile based on information available from at least one an OHR Application and an RFCA Application***. CERN teaches an OHR application and Lillibridge teaches an RFCA Application (Lillibridge, Col. 8, lines 35-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Behera method by using information from OHR Application and RFCA Application to build the electronic profile in order to distribute object to a user or a group via IP address.

11. Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039].

Regarding to claim 5, Kraenzel teaches a method for managing a user profile (Kraenzel, Abstract), wherein user profiles and objects are stored in one or more database (Col. 2, Lines 50-56). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As illustrated at FIG. 2, profile system 14 may use a data-mining technique to generate a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, Lines 45-46). Profile system 14 includes a plurality of modules, such as ACL accessing object, access-determining object, topic- determining object, for generating a user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, Lines 1-15). A generated user profile is used to determine the objects accessible by a particular user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 20-31). As seen, profile system 14 with a plurality of modules for generating a user profile to

determine the objects accessible by a particular user, who does not have the right to access the objects before the process of generating his/her profile as ***provided capabilities for a user to request access to information that the user currently does not have access to***. The modules as discussed above will go over each condition of the requested profile to determine accessible objects, such as which objects the user has been given access privileges, what subject matter could be accessible, what privileges a user has for that object, for example, read-only, manager, to determine access right (Kraenzel, Col. 3, Lines 1-10). As seen, the module as a tracking component coupled to the database as centralized interactive database goes over each condition of requested profile for determining accessible objects. In other words, the technique as discussed performs the claimed ***tracking a status of the request using a tracking component coupled to the centralized interactive database***. Those conditions will be determined by using access control list (Kraenzel, Col. 3, Lines 43-58) as the step of ***obtaining a decision from an owner of the data requested***, and thereafter is the step of ***adding at least one of a rule and the user to the database, if the decision is access approval*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, Line 66-Col. 4, Line 15). As illustrated at FIG. 3, step 156 determines ***if*** the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), ***the user is denied access***, and step 162 ***prompts the user to complete a request for quick approval*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 31-35). Step 166 determines if additional privilege have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, the ACL is updated to retrieve and present the requested object to the user (Kraenzel, Col. 4, Lines 35-43). As seen, additional privilege as ***additional rule including pre-established criteria***, determining the

granting status of additional privilege indicates the step of ***applying the access rule to the completed request for quick approval***, and granting the additional privilege indicates the step of ***approving automatically access based on the exception rule***. Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of ***notifying the user of the decision*** if the decision is access approval when generating a user profile. However, as illustrated at FIG. 2, after the process of determining accessible objects, user privileges and adding rule to a user profile from 104 to 110, the user profile is compiled and presented to the user at steps 112 and 114. Obviously, by presenting the profile to the user, the compiled profile implied an access approval notification. In addition, Kraenzel teaches the technique of access denied notification at step 164 of FIG. 3. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a notification message to indicate an approval decision in order to confirm a user access right before presenting the profile to a user.

Regarding claim 6, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***obtaining at least one of an approval decision and a disapproval decision*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 7, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***reviewing and auditing the user access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 8, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating a consistent security model that includes centralized administration of security of the system and uses single user profile and privilege for accessing different applications*** (Col. 3, lines 1-15; Col. 4, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 9, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***creating user profiles; providing access control to data associated with user profiles; defining permissions based on a user identifier associated with user profiles; and developing a specification for user interfaces*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, line 1-Col. 4, line 13).

Regarding claim 10, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step ***providing administration of a common security model for access control and event notification*** (Kraenzel, FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 11, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***updating profiles automatically on at least one of a pre-determined timed interval and a change in organization hierarchy*** (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42).

Regarding claim 12, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel does not explicitly teach the step of ***updating profiles automatically when a user transfers departments***. However, as disclosed by Kraenzel, profile system 14 may automatically update a user's profile by periodically checking the ACL of the network. This may be performed on a routine basis, or on a random basis, when requested by a system administrator, or at various other instances. System 14 may also use the above process for updating a user profile by simply adding supplemental information to the user profile (Kraenzel, Col. 3, lines 33-42). Thus, when a user transfers departments, system administrator updates the ACL, and user profile will be updated automatically. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel and Stockwell method by including the step of updating profiles when a user transfers department in order to control access to a database.

Regarding claim 13, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***generating access list reports that identify accessible and non-accessible data and restrictions for access*** (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 20-26 and Col. 2, lines 12-16).

Regarding claim 14, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel further discloses the step of ***retrieving***

information from the centralized database in response to a specific inquiry from an administrator (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43).

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039] in view of Stockwell et al. [USP 5,950,195].

Regarding claim 15, Kraenzel teaches all the claim subject matters as discussed above with respect to claim 5, Kraenzel fails to teach ***the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet***. Stockwell discloses ***the client system and the server system are connected via a network and wherein the network is one of a wide area network, a local area network, an intranet and the Internet*** (Stockwell, Col. 4, lines 21-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kraenzel method by including a network in order to process the method for the remote users.

13. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behera [USP 6,535,879] in view of Kraenzel [USP 6,513,039 B1].

Regarding to claim 16, Behera teaches a LDAP as a database configured to be protected from access by using Access Control List or ACL. The Directory Server Administrator creates basic ACL rules that grant specific users access to certain

information in the directory (Behera, Col. 3, lines 9-37). Behera further discloses the ACL rules that comprises a group based access guidelines based on the attributes to set up the rule (Behera, Col. 4, lines 42-44) as ***data corresponding to pre-established criteria developed from access rules and criteria including at least one of Rule Based Access guidelines, Group Based Access guidelines, Search & Subscribe Utilities guidelines, Active Positioning Monitoring guidelines, Hard Exclusion Rules guidelines, and Access Audits guidelines***. As in Behera, Col. 4, Lines 40-41, in order to allow access to a specific user, user name and access privileges such as read, write are used

ACL: (list of attrs) (allow(read) user= "prasanta")

As seen, a user can retrieve data in the database corresponding to the read applications, the read application is cross-referenced against an access privilege (read) as unique identifiers, and user name as data corresponding user that cross-references user name against "prasanta" as unique identifier. In other words, the technique as discussed indicates ***data corresponding to applications, including system administrator defined attributes that cross-references the applications profile data against unique identifiers; data corresponding to users that includes a user's organization and citizenship that cross-references the users profile data against unique identifiers***. Although the directory server matches the desired attributes within the specified attribute fieldname with the user's attributes for allowing access to the directory entry only if the user has the desired attribute values. Behera fails to teach ***data corresponding to pre-determined rules and methodologies that facilitates accurate user access-decision making***. Kraenzel teaches a method for generating a profile of a network user based on a user's access privileges

stored in an access control list (ACL). Profile generating systems is a client/server system having multiple users connected over a network, wherein users may also be connected to one or more databases via the network (Kraenzel, Col. 1, lines 13-18). As shown in FIG. 3, a user accesses a requested object in a database at step 152. The user's access privileges for the object(s) requested is retrieved at step 154. Based on step 154, step 156 determines whether the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements set by the object administrator. If the user's access privileges meet the minimum requirements, step 158 retrieves the requested object and step 160 presents the object(s) to the user. If, however, step 156 determines that the user's access privileges do not meet the minimum requirements set by a system administrator for that object(s), step 162 determines whether the user has requested additional privileges from the system administrator. If additional privileges have not been requested, step 164 notifies the user that access has been denied. Otherwise, step 166 determines if additional privileges have been granted. If additional privileges have been granted, step 168 updates the ACL and may proceed to retrieve and present the requested object using steps 158 and 160 respectively. If step 166 determines that additional privileges have not been granted, the user may be notified that access has been denied using step 164 (Kraenzel, Col. 4, lines 20-43). As seen, the procedure for accessing a requested object of FIG. 3 as ***predetermined rules and methodologies that facilitates accurate user access-decision making***. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Behera

technique by using the method of access as taught by Kraenzel in order to process an access request of a user.

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner Hung Pham
November 29, 2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER